

\*E-Filed: April 24, 2015\*

NOT FOR CITATION  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## SAN JOSE DIVISION

TESSERA, INC.,

No. C10-04435 EJD (HRL)

Plaintiff,

**ORDER RE: DISCOVERY DISPUTE  
JOINT REPORT #8**

v.

UTAC (TAIWAN) CORPORATION,

**[Dkt. No. 275]**

Defendant.

Plaintiff Tessera, Inc. (“Tessera”) sues Defendant UTAC (Taiwan) Corporation (“UTC”) for alleged failure to pay royalties under a license agreement. The first phase of this action concerned a contract interpretation dispute between Tessera and UTC about the criteria for determining which UTC products are royalty-bearing. Following discovery on that subject, the parties submitted summary judgment motions relating to contract interpretation, which were ruled on by the court.

In the second phase of this action, Tessera served UTC with infringement disclosures identifying the products that Tessera contends are royalty-bearing under the agreement. Tessera’s July 8, 2014 disclosures identified 32 claims of 12 licensed patents and provided claim charts contending that two types of UTC packages—its w-BGA packages and DFN packages—are covered by the claims of licensed patents and are therefore royalty-bearing. Tessera’s disclosure asserted that Tessera did not have enough information to determine whether a third type of package,

1 UTC's LGA SiP package, is covered by the claims of the licensed patents and is therefore royalty-  
2 bearing. UTC disputes Tessera's contentions, and also served Tessera with invalidity contentions.

3 UTC has filed a motion for partial summary judgment, which is currently pending. Dkt.  
4 Nos. 208, 247. Tessera opposed the motion, and the court has not yet issued a ruling. The parties  
5 have also briefed and argued claim construction issues, and the court has not yet issued a claim  
6 construction order.

7 Presently before the Court is the parties' Discovery Dispute Joint Report ("DDJR") #8. Dkt.  
8 No. 275. The parties' dispute relates to the following Tessera discovery requests: RFP Nos. 24-32  
9 and 35-36, Interrogatory No. 19, and Tessera's First Request for Inspection. Tessera argues that  
10 UTC should be compelled to provide discovery responsive to these requests because UTC has failed  
11 to make a meaningful disclosure about the technological details of UTC's products and  
12 manufacturing processes. In the alternative, Tessera argues that UTC should be precluded from  
13 arguing that its products are not covered by the licensed patent claims. UTC argues that Tessera's  
14 requests for discovery are either moot because UTC has produced or agreed to produce the  
15 requested information, or burdensome and irrelevant.

16 First, the Court will address RFPs 24-32 and 35-36. Tessera argues that it is entitled to  
17 production of technical documents describing UTC's royalty-bearing products, including: data  
18 sheets and other documents describing the properties of the materials used in UTC's royalty-bearing  
19 packages, factory-level instructions regarding assembly of the royalty-bearing packages, and bill of  
20 materials for the royalty-bearing packages.

21 RFP 24 seeks "Documents sufficient to identify all UTC Packages." RFP 25 seeks  
22 "Documents sufficient to identify all w-BGA Packages from before September 24, 2010." RFP 26  
23 seeks "Documents sufficient to identify all w-BGA Packages from after September 24, 2010." RFP  
24 27 seeks "Documents sufficient to describe the structure of each UTC Package and w-BGA  
25 Package."

26 UTC has already provided technical documents relating to w-BGA packages. These include  
27 package drawings, wiring diagrams, bills of materials, and specifications for the various assembly  
28

1 steps and processes involved in making these packages. UTC has provided responsive documents to  
2 satisfy RFPs 24-27, and Tessera has not articulated a basis for contending otherwise.

3 In addition, a request for all revisions or versions of the technical information from 2010  
4 onwards is irrelevant, burdensome and overbroad. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(C)(iii) (a court must  
5 limit discovery when “the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit,  
6 considering the needs of the case, the amount in controversy, the parties’ resources, the importance  
7 of the issues at stake in the action, and the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues”).  
8 UTC has already produced the operative versions of its engineering drawings and other technical  
9 documents. Tessera’s request that UTC produce all revisions or versions of these documents that  
10 may have existed over the last several years would encompass essentially all technical and  
11 engineering documents that ever existed at the company. Searching for and collecting all such  
12 materials would be burdensome. Moreover, Tessera has not provided a justification for imposing  
13 that burden. Not all versions or revisions would be relevant. The patents Tessera has asserted for  
14 its royalty claim concern a limited set of features and components of a semiconductor package.  
15 UTC has already provided a full production of the operative technical documents concerning its  
16 packages. UTC’s burden of attempting to comply with such a request outweighs any purported  
17 benefit to Tessera. Tessera must identify any particular documents and versions or revisions it  
18 contends would be relevant before production of these materials will be compelled.

19 RFP 28 seeks “Documents sufficient to describe the processes used to make each UTC  
20 Package and w-BGA Package.” RFP 29 seeks “Documents sufficient to describe the operation  
21 (including the thermal, mechanical and electrical behavior) of each UTC Package and w-BGA  
22 package.” RFP 30 seeks “All technical drawings (such as bond diagrams, substrate diagrams,  
23 package-outline drawings, unit-detail drawings) for each UTC Package and w-BGA package.” RFP  
24 31 seeks “All specifications for each UTC Package and w-BGA package.”

25 In regards to RFPs 28-30, UTC has produced responsive documents and is not aware of  
26 anything more that should or could be produced. UTC has produced documentation responsive to  
27 RFP 31, and is searching for more at Tessera’s request.  
28

1 RFP 32 seeks “Documents sufficient to describe the materials (including the material’s  
2 commercial name, chemical composition, thermos-mechanical properties, and geometry and  
3 dimensions of the material) used in each UTC Package and w-BGA package, including mold  
4 compounds, encapsulants, Underfills, solder-masks, die attach materials, die contacts, solder,  
5 package substrate, and interposer materials.”

6 In regards to RFP 32, as well as RFPs 28-29, UTC is willing to search for and produce data  
7 sheets for components that may be relevant to the case: die attach, molding component, encapsulant,  
8 substrate, gold wire and solder balls. UTC is not aware of any others that are relevant. UTC has  
9 requested that Tessera identify any others it contends would be relevant and explain the basis, but  
10 Tessera has failed to do so. In regards to Tessera’s argument that UTC’s production in response to  
11 RFP 32 may not include all “bills of materials,” Tessera has failed to identify anything that may be  
12 missing.

13 RFPs 35 and 36 seek eight samples of each of the UTC and w-BGA packages. In response  
14 to RFPs 35-36, UTC has sent sample packages of its w-BGA packages to Tessera’s counsel.

15 Second, Tessera argues that UTC should be compelled to answer Interrogatory 19, which  
16 requests: “For each technical document produced by UTC in this litigation, identify which Packages  
17 at Issue the document describes or covers and any unique naming convention or identifiers used by  
18 UTC or its customer(s) for the Package at Issue described or covered by that document.” According  
19 to Tessera, a response is necessary because the technical materials that UTC produced refer to UTC  
20 packages with inconsistent identifiers. However, no such correlation table matching technical  
21 documents to royalty reports exists, and UTC is not required to create one. Nevertheless, UTC  
22 agreed to create one, and is currently doing so.

23 Third, Tessera argues that it should be permitted to inspect UTC’s manufacturing facility  
24 located at 2, Li Hsin Road 3, Science Based Industrial Park, Hsinchu, Taiwan. Tessera argues that  
25 an inspection would permit Tessera’s experts to observe and document pertinent features of UTC’s  
26 manufacturing processes and royalty-bearing products that cannot be inferred through other  
27 discovery. In addition, Tessera argues that the claim constructions that UTC has argued that the  
28

1 Court should adopt seek to add numerous difficult-to-prove limitations to Tessera's process claims,  
2 adding to the need for this inspection.

3 UTC has concerns about the disruptiveness and invasiveness of a proposed inspection, given  
4 that information belonging to UTC's customers could be inadvertently disclosed during the  
5 inspection. UTC has asked Tessera to explain what information, if any, it believes an inspection  
6 could provide that is not already provided in the technical documents UTC has produced. Tessera  
7 has not done so. Before an inspection of UTC's manufacturing facility will be compelled, Tessera  
8 must specify what information it believes an inspection could provide that is not already provided in  
9 the technical documents UTC has produced.

10 Accordingly, Tessera's request for discovery responsive to RFPs 24-32 and 35-36,  
11 Interrogatory 19, and Tessera's First Request for Inspection is denied. In addition, Tessera's request  
12 that UTC be precluded from arguing that its products are not covered by Tessera's patent claims is  
13 also denied.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated: April 24, 2015



16 **HOWARD R. LLOYD**  
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**C10-04435 EJD (HRL) Order will be electronically mailed to:**

Anup M Shah ashah@kslaw.com

Benjamin W. Hattenbach bhattenbach@irell.com

David H. Herrington dherrington@cgsh.com, dherrington@cgsh.com

Dominik B. Slusarczyk dslusarczyk@irell.com, mspillner@tessera.com

Jackson Samuel Trugman jtrugman@irell.com

Jacob Johnston jjohnston@cgsh.com

Joseph Mark Lipner jlipner@irell.com, csilver@irell.com, hhyun@irell.com, slee@irell.com

Lawrence B. Friedman lfriedman@cgsh.com, maofiling@cgsh.com

Michael F. Heafey mheafey@kslaw.com, rgowins@kslaw.com

Morgan Chu mchu@irell.com

Morvarid Metanat mmetanat@orrick.com

Nathaniel E. Jedrey njedrey@cgsh.com

Polina Bensman lbensman@cgsh.com

Richard William Krebs rkrebs@irell.com, cmedina@irell.com, rbrown@tessera.com, Slee@irell.com, sveeraraghavan@tessera.com, tegarcia@tessera.com

Ryan Alexander Ward rward@irell.com

Sri Kuehnlenz skuehnlenz@cgsh.com

**Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel who have not registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.**